



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/051,545	01/18/2002	Yanfeng Lu	1565.005US1	9644
21186	7590	03/02/2006	EXAMINER	
SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH 1600 TCF TOWER 121 SOUTH EIGHT STREET MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			LIN, WEN TAI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2154	

DATE MAILED: 03/02/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/051,545

Applicant(s)

LU, YANFENG

Examiner

Wen-Tai Lin

Art Unit

2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 January 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 16-23 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-9 and 16-23 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-9 and 16-23 are presented for examination.
2. The text of those sections of Title 35, USC code not included in this action can be found in the prior Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. Claims 1-9, 16-21 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Jamtgaard et al.[U.S. Pat. No.6430624].
4. As to claim 1, Jamtgaard teaches the invention as claimed including: A method of providing concurrent access to data on cross-computing environments [e.g., Figs. 1-2], comprising:
 - receiving a first request for the data from a first computing environment [e.g., any of the appliances in 15, Fig.2];
 - receiving a second request for the data from a second computing environment, wherein the second computing environment is different from the first computing environment [e.g., any of the other appliances in 15, Fig.2];

identifying a first message file to service the requests [e.g., a XSL rule set used by XML engine; col.6, lines 32-53]; and

concurrently providing access to the first message file to both the first computing environment and the second computing environment in order to load the data as directed by the first request from the first computing environment and the second request from the second computing environment,

wherein the first message file is for dynamically rendering and translating the data into a desired language associated with the first and second requests and wherein at least a portion of the message file is dynamically resolved in response to the first computing environment [e.g., resolving for the display screen size of the device in the first computing environment], and wherein the portion is different from another portion that is dynamically resolved from the message file in response to the second computing environment [e.g., resolving for a different display screen size of the device in the second computing environment (see col.18, line 46 – col.20, line 8)].

5. As to claims 2-4, Jamtgaard further teaches loading the first message file into a memory or a data store before providing the message file to the requests, wherein the first message file is identified with a first language associated with the requests [e.g., 47, Figs. 4 & 8; col.19, lines 9-12].

6. As to claim 5, Jamtgaard further teaches that in providing the first message file, the first message file is represented in a generic file format [e.g., in XSL format].

7. As to claim 6, Jamtgaard further teaches that:

loading the first message file into a memory;

receiving a third request from a third computing environment for the data, wherein the third request requires a second message file associated with a different language than required by the first request and the second request;

identifying the second message file;

loading the second message file into the memory concurrently with the loaded first message file; and

concurrently providing access to the second message file in order to load the data as required by the third request from the third computing environment while access is provided to the first message file to satisfy the first request and the second request.

[col.8, lines 46-67; e.g., the first and second requests use XML language for rendering the content, while the third request coming from a wireless device requiring a wireless markup language (WML), therefore the second message file would be different from the first message file].

8. As to claims 7-9 and 16, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-6, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-6 above.

9. As to claim 23, Jamtgaard further teaches that the requests and the message files are represented in an extensible markup language format [e.g., Fig.2].

10. As to claims 17-21, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-9 and 16, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-9 and 16 above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jamtgaard et al.(hereafter "Jamtgaard")[U.S. Pat. No.6430624], as applied to claims 1-9, 16-21 and 23 above, further in view of Official Notice.

12. As to claim 22, Jamtgaard does not specifically teach that the system further comprises a single application programming interface library providing an interface between the set of language manager executable instructions and the requests from the computing environments.

However, Official Notice is taken that using API in various application environment is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use an API directly accessible by the operating system of Jamtgaard's computer for providing the interface as claimed because the use of API greatly simplifies the programming/development effort.

Applicant's arguments filed on 1/23/2006 for claims 1-9 and 16-23 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

13. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

14. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

15. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: White et al. [US PGPub. 2005/0027709], discloses a method and system for dynamically presenting web pages according to the language setting of the requesting devices.

Conclusion

Examiner note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant. Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings of the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant in preparing responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the contest of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the Examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (571)272-3969. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00) .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (571)272-3964. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(571)273-8300 for official communications; and

(571)273-3969 for status inquires draft communication.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Wen-Tai Lin

February 28, 2006

Wen-Tai Lin
2/28/06